

## REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Applicant has amended these claims to correct the deficiencies noted by the Examiner. The Applicant therefore submits that the claims now comply with the second paragraph of §112.

In an Office Action dated January 10, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-15, 17-20 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baba in view of Braun. The Applicant submits that the combination of Baba and Braun does not render obvious the claims because together these references do not disclose all of the limitations recited in the claims. The claims recite a robot which has a monitor that displays an image captured by a camera of a remote station. Neither Baba or Braun disclose this limitation. While corresponding the claim limitations with corresponding elements of Baba, the Examiner states, "A robot apparatus 2, (see Fig. 3) that comprises a head camera, earphone and microphone coupled to image selection portion;". Noticeably missing from this list of elements is a monitor that displays an image captured by a camera at a remote station that controls the robot. Baba does not disclose this limitation. Additionally, Braun does not disclose this limitation. Consequently, the combination of Baba and Braun do not disclose all of the limitations recited in the claims. Lacking this limitation, these references do not render obvious the claims of the above entitled application.

In an Advisory Action dated April 7, 2006, the Examiner cites the image monitor 39 and image/sound converter 38 in Baba as being a "monitor that displays an image captured by a camera at a remote station that controls the robot". The language contained within the quotes for is a monitor of the robot. The image monitor 39 shown in Fig. 3 of Baba is for the remote station, not the robot. The claims of the above entitled application recite a system and method wherein a robot captures an image that is displayed by a head worn device, and an image that is captured by a remote station camera that is displayed by the robot. There are two images, one captured by the robot and another captured at the remote station. Baba does not disclose a system that captures images at both the robot and the remote station, which are then displayed by monitors of the remote station and robot respectively. The remote station of Baba does not contain a camera. The remote station of Baba contains a monitor 39. The monitor displays an image converted by the image sound converter. The monitor is not a camera which captures an image that is then sent to the robot. There is nothing in Baba which discusses the monitor as

being an image-capturing device. Additionally, an inspection of Fig. 3 shows a one-way arrow going from the image sound converter to the monitor. There is not a reverse flow from the monitor to the converter. Baba does not disclose a remote station that has a camera that captures a remote station image as recited by the claims. Consequently, the combination of Baba and Braun do not contain all of the limitations of the claims.


The Examiner rejected claims 2, 7, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baba in view of Pin. The Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for being dependent upon allowable independent claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1 - 28 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

IRELL & MANELLA LLP


Dated: May 17, 2006

  
Ben Yorks, Reg. No. 33,609

840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
949-760-0991

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 17, 2006.

  
Susan Langworthy Date May 17, 2006